



U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Application Number	Filing Date	First Named Applicant	Attorney Docket Number
09/076,956	05/13/98	Baranova	9710-007

Examiner
L. E. Crane

Art Unit	Paper No.
1623	21

DATE MAILED: n/a

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel)

(1) Mr. Max Bachrach (3) Examiner L. E. Crane

(2) Mr. David L. Bradfute (Attny for Genset)

(4)

Date of Interview: May 9, 2000

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy given to) applicant applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No If yes, brief description: See attachment.

Agreement was reached with respect to some of all of the claims in question. was not reached

Claim(s) discussed: See page 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: See page 2.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment:
See page 2.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would be allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP § 713.04) If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, the completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

PTO-413 (amended 4/4/97)

Interview Summary

09/076,956

COPY FOR File Applicant

Continued on next page(s) ->->

Art Unit 1623

INTERVIEW SUMMARY(cont.)

Claims discussed: All claims remaining of record, claims 80-103 specifically.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lyttle, Vu and Nelson references.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comment: Applicant noted that the Vu reference had a publication date substantially after both the 371 date and the publication date of the foreign priority document. Applicant requested withdrawal of the rejection relying on Vu et al. to which examiner agreed. Several of the 112 issues raised by examiner in the most recent office action were discussed and guidance was provided by examiner. The prior art rejection involving Lyttle was discussed and examiner indicated that short of a request for declaration of an interference examiner was powerless to withdraw that reference. Applicant noted that Lyttle's claims were limited to method claims only, and that interference required interfering claims. Examiner took this under advisement.